



# FEP Medical Policy Manual

## FEP 7.01.116 Facet Joint Denervation

**Annual Effective Policy Date: April 1, 2024**

**Original Policy Date: June 2012**

**Related Policies:**

7.01.120 - Facet Arthroplasty

## Facet Joint Denervation

### Description

#### Description

Facet denervation is used to treat neck and back pain originating in facet joints with degenerative changes. Diagnosis of facet joint pain is confirmed by response to nerve blocks. The goal of facet denervation is long-term pain relief. However, the nerves regenerate and, therefore, repeat procedures may be required.

Facet joint denervation is performed under local anesthetic and with fluoroscopic guidance. A needle or probe is directed to the median branch of the dorsal ganglion innervating the facet joint, where multiple thermal lesions are produced, typically by an RF generator. A variety of terms may be used to describe RF denervation (eg, rhizotomy, rhizolysis). In addition, the structures to which the RF energy is directed may be referred to as facet joint, facet nerves, medial nerve or branch, median nerve or branch, or dorsal root ganglion.

Alternative methods of denervation include pulsed RF, laser, chemodenervation, and cryoablation. Pulsed RF consists of short bursts of electric current of high voltage in the RF range but without heating the tissue enough to cause coagulation. RF is suggested as a possibly safer alternative to thermal RF facet denervation. Temperatures do not exceed 42°C at the probe tip versus temperatures in the 60°C range reached in thermal RF denervation, and tissues may cool between pulses. It is postulated that transmission across small unmyelinated nerve fibers is disrupted but not permanently damaged, while large myelinated fibers are not affected. With chemical denervation, injections with a diluted phenol solution, a chemical ablating agent, are injected into the facet joint nerve.

## OBJECTIVE

The objectives of this evidence review are to determine whether the use of (1) medial branch blocks to identify individuals with facet joint pain; (2) radiofrequency ablation to treat individuals with facet joint pain; and (3) therapeutic medial branch blocks or alternative methods of denervation to treat individuals with facet joint pain improves the net health outcome.

## POLICY STATEMENT

Nonpulsed radiofrequency denervation of cervical facet joints (C3 to 4 and below) and lumbar facet joints is considered **medically necessary** when ALL of the following criteria are met.

- No prior spinal fusion surgery in the vertebral level being treated; AND
- Disabling low back (lumbosacral) or neck (cervical) pain, suggestive of facet joint origin as evidenced by absence of nerve root compression as documented in the medical record on history, physical, and radiographic evaluations; and the pain is not radicular; AND
- Pain has failed to respond to 3 months of conservative management, which may consist of therapies such as nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory medications, acetaminophen, manipulation, physical therapy, and a home exercise program; AND
- There has been a successful trial of controlled medial branch blocks (see Policy Guidelines section); AND
- If there has been a prior successful radiofrequency denervation, a minimum time of 6 months has elapsed since prior radiofrequency treatment (per side, per anatomic level of the spine).

Radiofrequency denervation is considered **investigational** for the treatment of chronic spinal or back pain for all uses that do not meet the criteria listed above, including, but not limited to, the treatment of thoracic facet joint pain.

All other methods of denervation are considered **investigational** for the treatment of chronic spinal or back pain, including, but not limited to, pulsed radiofrequency denervation, laser denervation, chemodenervation (eg, alcohol, phenol, or high concentration local anesthetics), and cryodenervation.

Therapeutic medial branch blocks are considered **investigational**.

If there has been a prior successful radiofrequency denervation, additional diagnostic medial branch blocks for the same level of the spine are **investigational**.

## POLICY GUIDELINES

A successful trial of controlled diagnostic medial branch blocks consists of 2 separate positive blocks on different days with local anesthetic only (no steroids or other drugs), or a placebo-controlled series of blocks, under fluoroscopic guidance, that has resulted in at least a 50% reduction in pain for the duration of the local anesthetic used (eg, 3 hours longer with bupivacaine than lidocaine). No therapeutic intra-articular injections (ie, steroids, saline, or other substances) should be administered for a period of at least 4 weeks prior to the diagnostic medial branch block. The diagnostic blocks should involve the levels being considered for radiofrequency treatment and should not be conducted under intravenous sedation unless specifically indicated (eg, the individual is unable to cooperate with the procedure). These diagnostic blocks should be targeted to the likely pain generator. Single-level blocks lead to more precise diagnostic information, but multiple single-level blocks require several visits and additional exposure to radiation.

## BENEFIT APPLICATION

Experimental or investigational procedures, treatments, drugs, or devices are not covered (See General Exclusion Section of brochure).

## FDA REGULATORY STATUS

A number of RF generators and probes have been cleared for marketing by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) through the 510(k) process. In 2005, the SInergy (Kimberly Clark/Baylis), a water-cooled single-use probe, was cleared by the FDA, listing the Baylis Pain Management Probe as a predicate device. The intended use is with an RF generator to create RF lesions in nervous tissue. FDA product code: GXD.

## RATIONALE

### Summary of Evidence

For individuals with suspected facet joint pain who receive diagnostic medial branch blocks, the evidence includes systematic reviews, a small randomized trial, and observational studies. Relevant outcomes are other test performance measures, symptoms, and functional outcomes. There is considerable controversy about the role of these blocks, the number of positive blocks required, and the extent of pain relief obtained. Studies have reported the use of single or double blocks and at least 50% or 80% improvement in pain and function. This evidence has suggested that there are relatively few patients who exhibit pain relief following 2 nerve blocks, but that these select patients may have pain relief for several months following radiofrequency (RF) denervation. Other large series have reported the prevalence and false-positive rates following controlled diagnostic blocks, although there are issues with the reference standards used in these studies because there is no criterion standard for the diagnosis of facet joint pain. There is level I evidence for the use of medial branch blocks for diagnosing chronic lumbar facet joint pain and level II evidence for diagnosing cervical and thoracic facet joint pain. The evidence available supports a threshold of at least 75% to 80% pain relief to reduce the false-positive rate. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals with facet joint pain who receive radiofrequency ablation (RFA), the evidence includes systematic reviews and randomized controlled trials (RCTs). Relevant outcomes are symptoms, functional outcomes, quality of life, and medication use. While the evidence is limited to RCTs with small sample sizes, RF facet denervation appears to provide at least 50% pain relief in carefully selected patients. Diagnosis of facet joint pain is difficult. However, response to controlled medial branch blocks and the presence of tenderness over the facet joint appear to be reliable predictors of success. When RF facet denervation is successful, repeat treatments appear to have similar success rates and duration of pain relief. Thus, the data indicate that, in carefully selected individuals with lumbar or cervical facet joint pain, RF treatments can improve outcomes. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals with facet joint pain who receive therapeutic medial nerve branch blocks or alternative methods of facet joint denervation, the evidence includes a systematic review, randomized trials without a sham control, and uncontrolled case series. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, functional outcomes, quality of life, and medication use. Pulsed RF does not appear to be as effective as conventional RF denervation, and there is insufficient evidence to evaluate the efficacy of other methods of denervation (eg, alcohol, laser, cryodenervation) for facet joint pain or the effect of therapeutic medial branch blocks on facet joint pain. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

## SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

### Practice Guidelines and Position Statements

Guidelines or position statements will be considered for inclusion in 'Supplemental Information' if they were issued by, or jointly by, a US professional society, an international society with US representation, or National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Priority will be given to guidelines that are informed by a systematic review, include strength of evidence ratings, and include a description of management of conflict of interest.

### American Association of Neurological Surgeons and Congress of Neurological Surgeons

In 2014, the American Association of Neurological Surgeons and the Congress of Neurological Surgeons updated their joint guidelines on the treatment of degenerative disease of the lumbar spine.<sup>35</sup> The 2 groups provided grade B recommendations: (1) intra-articular injections of lumbar facet joints were not suggested for the treatment of facet-mediated chronic low back pain; (2) medial nerve blocks were suggested for the short-term relief of facet-mediated chronic low back pain; and (3) lumbar medial nerve ablation was suggested for the short-term (3- to 6-month) relief of facet-mediated pain in patients who have chronic lower back pain without radiculopathy from degenerative disease of the lumbar spine.

## American Society of Interventional Pain Physicians

In 2020, the American Society of Interventional Pain Physicians published guidelines on use of facet joint interventions for management of chronic spinal pain.<sup>36</sup> Use of facet joint nerve blocks for diagnosis of facet joint pain is recommended with a moderate to strong strength of recommendation for the lumbar spine (evidence level I to II), moderate strength for the cervical spine (evidence level II), and moderate strength for the thoracic spine (evidence level II); a criterion standard of  $\geq 80\%$  pain relief was included for these recommendations. Radiofrequency ablation (RFA) is recommended for treatment of pain in the lumbar spine (moderate strength recommendation; evidence level II), cervical spine (moderate strength recommendation; evidence level II), and thoracic spine (weak to moderate strength recommendation; evidence level III). Facet joint nerve blocks are recommended for treatment of pain in the lumbar spine (moderate strength recommendation; evidence level II), cervical spine (moderate strength recommendation; evidence level II), and thoracic spine (weak to moderate strength recommendation; evidence level III). Treatment of facet joint pain with intraarticular injections is a weak strength recommendation with lower levels of evidence (level III, IV, and V evidence for the thoracic, lumbar, and cervical spine respectively).

## International Working Group Consensus Guidelines

International consensus guidelines from 13 different pain societies (2020) provide recommendations regarding interventions for lumbar facet joint pain specifically.<sup>37</sup> When used for diagnosis, the guidelines suggest that intra-articular injections are more diagnostic than medial branch blocks (MBB), but note that intra-articular injections have a high technical failure rate and provide less predictive value when administered prior to RFA (grade B evidence, low level of certainty). For therapeutic treatment of lumbar facet pain the guideline recommends against use of medial branch blocks or intra-articular injections (grade D evidence, moderate level of certainty), although acknowledges certain clinical scenarios which may warrant these techniques, such as a contraindication to RFA.

Similarly, 18 pain societies created consensus guidelines on interventions for cervical spine joint pain (2022).<sup>38</sup> The group states, "Medial branch RFA is considered to be a definitive durable analgesic treatment for patients with neck pain arising from the cervical facet joints." They also state, "...MBB meet most criteria as a diagnostic intervention for cervical joint-mediated pain...."

## The World Federation of Neurosurgical Societies Spine Committee

The World Federation of Neurosurgical Societies Spine Committee (2020) released recommendations on the treatment of and pain relief techniques in patients with lumbar spinal stenosis.<sup>39</sup> Statements that reached a positive committee consensus regarding facet joint pain are listed below.

- "Statement 10: Facet joint injections provide a useful diagnostic tool for LBP [lower back pain]."

## National Institute for Health and Care Excellence

In 2016, the U.K. NICE published guidance on the assessment and management of low back pain and sciatica in those over 16 years of age.<sup>40</sup> NICE recommended that radiofrequency (RF) denervation can be considered for patients with chronic low back pain when "non-surgical treatment has not worked for them and the main source of pain is thought to come from structures supplied by the medial branch nerve and they have moderate or severe levels of localized back pain." Radiofrequency denervation should only be performed "after a positive response to a diagnostic medial branch block." The NICE cautioned that the length of pain relief after RF denervation is uncertain, and that results from repeat RF denervation procedures are also uncertain.

## North American Spine Society Guideline

In 2020, the North American Spine Society (NASS) published guidance on the diagnosis and management of nonspecific low back pain in those 18 years of age and older.<sup>41</sup> NASS recommends that in facet joint procedures, for patients responsive to a single diagnostic intra-articular injection with 50% relief, it is suggested that intra-articular steroids will provide no clinically meaningful improvement at 6 months (grade B level of evidence; fair evidence). Additionally, in these patients, there is insufficient evidence to recommend for or against using radiofrequency neurotomy or periarticular phenol injections (grade I, insufficient or conflicting evidence). There is insufficient evidence for or against the use of single-photon emission computerized tomography (SPECT) imaging or the use of uncontrolled medial branch blocks versus pericapsular blocks for the diagnosis of zygapophyseal joint pain (both grade 1, insufficient or conflicting evidence). There is insufficient evidence to recommend for or against using a 50% pain reduction following medial branch blockade to diagnose zygapophyseal joint pain (grade 1, insufficient or conflicting evidence). The use of cryodenervation has insufficient evidence for the treatment of zygapophyseal joint pain (grade I, insufficient or conflicting evidence); however, thermal radiofrequency ablation is suggested for patients with zygapophyseal joint low back pain, with relief durable for at least 6 months following the

procedure (grade B, fair evidence). Cooled radiofrequency ablation of sacral lateral branch nerves and the dorsal ramus of L5 can be considered for sacroiliac joint pain diagnosed by dual blocks (grade C, poor quality evidence).

## U.S. Preventive Services Task Force Recommendations

Not applicable.

## Medicare National Coverage

There is no national coverage determination. In the absence of a national coverage determination, coverage decisions are left to the discretion of local Medicare carriers.

## REFERENCES

1. Boswell MV, Manchikanti L, Kaye AD, et al. A Best-Evidence Systematic Appraisal of the Diagnostic Accuracy and Utility of Facet (Zygapophysial) Joint Injections in Chronic Spinal Pain. *Pain Physician*. 2015; 18(4): E497-533. PMID 26218947
2. Falco FJ, Datta S, Manchikanti L, et al. An updated review of the diagnostic utility of cervical facet joint injections. *Pain Physician*. 2012; 15(6): E807-38. PMID 23159977
3. Falco FJ, Manchikanti L, Datta S, et al. Systematic review of the therapeutic effectiveness of cervical facet joint interventions: an update. *Pain Physician*. 2012; 15(6): E839-68. PMID 23159978
4. Falco FJ, Manchikanti L, Datta S, et al. An update of the systematic assessment of the diagnostic accuracy of lumbar facet joint nerve blocks. *Pain Physician*. 2012; 15(6): E869-907. PMID 23159979
5. Falco FJ, Manchikanti L, Datta S, et al. An update of the effectiveness of therapeutic lumbar facet joint interventions. *Pain Physician*. 2012; 15(6): E909-53. PMID 23159980
6. Cohen SP, Strassels SA, Kurihara C, et al. Randomized study assessing the accuracy of cervical facet joint nerve (medial branch) blocks using different injectate volumes. *Anesthesiology*. Jan 2010; 112(1): 144-52. PMID 19996954
7. Cohen SP, Stojanovic MP, Crooks M, et al. Lumbar zygapophysial (facet) joint radiofrequency denervation success as a function of pain relief during diagnostic medial branch blocks: a multicenter analysis. *Spine J*. 2008; 8(3): 498-504. PMID 17662665
8. Pampati S, Cash KA, Manchikanti L. Accuracy of diagnostic lumbar facet joint nerve blocks: a 2-year follow-up of 152 patients diagnosed with controlled diagnostic blocks. *Pain Physician*. 2009; 12(5): 855-66. PMID 19787011
9. Manchikanti L, Pampati S, Cash KA. Making sense of the accuracy of diagnostic lumbar facet joint nerve blocks: an assessment of the implications of 50% relief, 80% relief, single block, or controlled diagnostic blocks. *Pain Physician*. 2010; 13(2): 133-43. PMID 20309379
10. Li H, An J, Zhang J, et al. Comparative efficacy of radiofrequency denervation in chronic low back pain: A systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Front Surg*. 2022; 9: 899538. PMID 35990102
11. Janapala RN, Manchikanti L, Sanapati MR, et al. Efficacy of Radiofrequency Neurotomy in Chronic Low Back Pain: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *J Pain Res*. 2021; 14: 2859-2891. PMID 34531682
12. Nath S, Nath CA, Pettersson K. Percutaneous lumbar zygapophysial (Facet) joint neurotomy using radiofrequency current, in the management of chronic low back pain: a randomized double-blind trial. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. May 20 2008; 33(12): 1291-7; discussion 1298. PMID 18496338
13. Tekin I, Mirzai H, Ok G, et al. A comparison of conventional and pulsed radiofrequency denervation in the treatment of chronic facet joint pain. *Clin J Pain*. 2007; 23(6): 524-9. PMID 17575493
14. van Wijk RM, Geurts JW, Wynne HJ, et al. Radiofrequency denervation of lumbar facet joints in the treatment of chronic low back pain: a randomized, double-blind, sham lesion-controlled trial. *Clin J Pain*. 2005; 21(4): 335-44. PMID 15951652
15. Lakemeier S, Lind M, Schultz W, et al. A comparison of intraarticular lumbar facet joint steroid injections and lumbar facet joint radiofrequency denervation in the treatment of low back pain: a randomized, controlled, double-blind trial. *Anesth Analg*. Jul 2013; 117(1): 228-35. PMID 23632051
16. Manchikanti L, Kaye AD, Boswell MV, et al. A Systematic Review and Best Evidence Synthesis of the Effectiveness of Therapeutic Facet Joint Interventions in Managing Chronic Spinal Pain. *Pain Physician*. 2015; 18(4): E535-82. PMID 26218948
17. Civelek E, Cansever T, Kabatas S, et al. Comparison of effectiveness of facet joint injection and radiofrequency denervation in chronic low back pain. *Turk Neurosurg*. 2012; 22(2): 200-6. PMID 22437295
18. Lord SM, Barnsley L, Wallis BJ, et al. Percutaneous radio-frequency neurotomy for chronic cervical zygapophysial-joint pain. *N Engl J Med*. Dec 05 1996; 335(23): 1721-6. PMID 8929263
19. van Eerd M, de Meij N, Kessels A, et al. Efficacy and Long-term Effect of Radiofrequency Denervation in Patients with Clinically Diagnosed Cervical Facet Joint Pain: A Double-blind Randomized Controlled Trial. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. Mar 01 2021; 46(5): 285-293. PMID 33534439
20. Husted DS, Orton D, Schofferman J, et al. Effectiveness of repeated radiofrequency neurotomy for cervical facet joint pain. *J Spinal Disord Tech*. Aug 2008; 21(6): 406-8. PMID 18679094
21. Schofferman J, Kine G. Effectiveness of repeated radiofrequency neurotomy for lumbar facet pain. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. Nov 01 2004; 29(21): 2471-3. PMID 15507813

22. Smuck M, Crisostomo RA, Trivedi K, et al. Success of initial and repeated medial branch neurotomy for zygapophysial joint pain: a systematic review. *PM R*. Sep 2012; 4(9): 686-92. PMID 22980421
23. Rambaransingh B, Stanford G, Burnham R. The effect of repeated zygapophysial joint radiofrequency neurotomy on pain, disability, and improvement duration. *Pain Med*. Sep 2010; 11(9): 1343-7. PMID 20667024
24. Manchikanti L, Singh V, Falco FJ, et al. Comparative outcomes of a 2-year follow-up of cervical medial branch blocks in management of chronic neck pain: a randomized, double-blind controlled trial. *Pain Physician*. 2010; 13(5): 437-50. PMID 20859313
25. Manchikanti L, Singh V, Falco FJ, et al. Evaluation of lumbar facet joint nerve blocks in managing chronic low back pain: a randomized, double-blind, controlled trial with a 2-year follow-up. *Int J Med Sci*. May 28 2010; 7(3): 124-35. PMID 20567613
26. Manchikanti L, Singh V, Falco FJ, et al. Comparative effectiveness of a one-year follow-up of thoracic medial branch blocks in management of chronic thoracic pain: a randomized, double-blind active controlled trial. *Pain Physician*. 2010; 13(6): 535-48. PMID 21102966
27. Manchikanti L, Singh V, Falco FJ, et al. The role of thoracic medial branch blocks in managing chronic mid and upper back pain: a randomized, double-blind, active-control trial with a 2-year followup. *Anesthesiol Res Pract*. 2012; 2012: 585806. PMID 22851967
28. Moussa WM, Khedr W, Elsayy M. Percutaneous pulsed radiofrequency treatment of dorsal root ganglion for treatment of lumbar facet syndrome. *Clin Neurol Neurosurg*. Dec 2020; 199: 106253. PMID 33045627
29. Hashemi M, Hashemian M, Mohajerani SA, et al. Effect of pulsed radiofrequency in treatment of facet-joint origin back pain in patients with degenerative spondylolisthesis. *Eur Spine J*. Sep 2014; 23(9): 1927-32. PMID 24997616
30. Kroll HR, Kim D, Danic MJ, et al. A randomized, double-blind, prospective study comparing the efficacy of continuous versus pulsed radiofrequency in the treatment of lumbar facet syndrome. *J Clin Anesth*. Nov 2008; 20(7): 534-7. PMID 19041042
31. Van Zundert J, Patijn J, Kessels A, et al. Pulsed radiofrequency adjacent to the cervical dorsal root ganglion in chronic cervical radicular pain: a double blind sham controlled randomized clinical trial. *Pain*. Jan 2007; 127(1-2): 173-82. PMID 17055165
32. Iwatsuki K, Yoshimine T, Awazu K. Alternative denervation using laser irradiation in lumbar facet syndrome. *Lasers Surg Med*. Mar 2007; 39(3): 225-9. PMID 17345622
33. Joo YC, Park JY, Kim KH. Comparison of alcohol ablation with repeated thermal radiofrequency ablation in medial branch neurotomy for the treatment of recurrent thoracolumbar facet joint pain. *J Anesth*. Jun 2013; 27(3): 390-5. PMID 23192698
34. Haufe SM, Mork AR. Endoscopic facet debridement for the treatment of facet arthritic pain—a novel new technique. *Int J Med Sci*. May 25 2010; 7(3): 120-3. PMID 20567612
35. Watters WC, Resnick DK, Eck JC, et al. Guideline update for the performance of fusion procedures for degenerative disease of the lumbar spine. Part 13: injection therapies, low-back pain, and lumbar fusion. *J Neurosurg Spine*. Jul 2014; 21(1): 79-90. PMID 24980590
36. Manchikanti L, Kaye AD, Soin A, et al. Comprehensive Evidence-Based Guidelines for Facet Joint Interventions in the Management of Chronic Spinal Pain: American Society of Interventional Pain Physicians (ASIPP) Guidelines Facet Joint Interventions 2020 Guidelines. *Pain Physician*. May 2020; 23(3S): S1-S127. PMID 32503359
37. Cohen SP, Bhaskar A, Bhatia A, et al. Consensus practice guidelines on interventions for lumbar facet joint pain from a multispecialty, international working group. *Reg Anesth Pain Med*. Jun 2020; 45(6): 424-467. PMID 32245841
38. Hurley RW, Adams MCB, Barad M, et al. Consensus practice guidelines on interventions for cervical spine (facet) joint pain from a multispecialty international working group. *Reg Anesth Pain Med*. Jan 2022; 47(1): 3-59. PMID 34764220
39. Fornari M, Robertson SC, Pereira P, et al. Conservative Treatment and Percutaneous Pain Relief Techniques in Patients with Lumbar Spinal Stenosis: WFNS Spine Committee Recommendations. *World Neurosurg*. Jul 2020; 7: 100079. PMID 32613192
40. National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE). NICE guideline [NG59]: Low back pain and sciatica in over 16s: assessment and management. 2016; <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/NG59>. Accessed September 18, 2023.
41. Evidence Based Clinical Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Spine Care: Diagnosis and Treatment of Low Back Pain. American Spine Society. Published 2020. Accessed September 18, 2023.



**POLICY HISTORY - THIS POLICY WAS APPROVED BY THE FEP® PHARMACY AND MEDICAL POLICY COMMITTEE ACCORDING TO THE HISTORY BELOW:**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Description</b>
June 2012	New policy	
March 2014	Replace policy	Policy updated with literature review. References 10-13, 24, 30, 35, 37- 38, and 41-42 added and reordered. Policy Guidelines added. Types of chemodenervation added to not medically necessary statement.
March 2015	Replace policy	Policy updated with literature review through September 16, 2014; Rationale section revised; references 20 and 31 added; some references removed; policy statements unchanged.
March 2018	Replace policy	Policy updated with literature review through September 11, 2017; reference 38 added. Policy statements unchanged except "not medically necessary, corrected to "investigational, due to FDA 501(k) status in the following statements: Radiofrequency denervation is considered investigational for the treatment of chronic spinal or back pain for all uses that do not meet the criteria listed above, including but not limited to treatment of thoracic facet joint pain; All other methods of denervation are considered investigational for the treatment of chronic spinal or back pain, including, but not limited to pulsed radiofrequency denervation, laser denervation, chemodenervation (eg, alcohol, phenol, or high concentration local anesthetics), and cryodenervation; Therapeutic medial branch blocks are considered investigational.
March 2019	Replace policy	Policy updated with literature review through September 6, 2018; no references added. Policy statements unchanged.
March 2020	Replace policy	Policy updated with literature review through September 9, 2019; no references added. Policy statements unchanged.
March 2021	Replace policy	Policy updated with literature review through September 18, 2020; references added. Policy statements unchanged.
March 2022	Replace policy	Policy updated with literature review through September 29, 2021; references added. Policy statements unchanged.
March 2023	Replace policy	Policy updated with literature review through September 30, 2022; references added. Not medically necessary policy language changed to investigational and other minor editorial refinements to policy statements; intent unchanged
March 2024	Replace policy	Policy updated with literature review through September 14, 2023; references added. Policy statements unchanged.

The policies contained in the FEP Medical Policy Manual are developed to assist in administering contractual benefits and do not constitute medical advice. They are not intended to replace or substitute for the independent medical judgment of a practitioner or other health care professional in the treatment of an individual member. The Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association does not intend by the FEP Medical Policy Manual, or by any particular medical policy, to recommend, advocate, encourage or discourage any particular medical technologies. Medical decisions relative to medical technologies are to be made strictly by members/patients in consultation with their health care providers. The conclusion that a particular service or supply is medically necessary does not constitute a representation or warranty that the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Service Benefit Plan covers (or pays for) this service or supply for a particular member.